

Decomposable form inequalities

By JEFFREY LIN THUNDER*

Abstract

We consider Diophantine inequalities of the kind $|F(\mathbf{x})| \leq m$, where $F(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{X}]$ is a homogeneous polynomial which can be expressed as a product of d homogeneous linear forms in n variables with complex coefficients and $m \geq 1$. We say such a form is of finite type if the total volume of all real solutions to this inequality is finite and if, for every n' -dimensional subspace $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, the corresponding n' -dimensional volume for F restricted to S is also finite.

We show that the number of integral solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ to our inequality above is finite for all m if and only if the form F is of finite type. When F is of finite type, we show that the number of integral solutions is estimated asymptotically as $m \rightarrow \infty$ by the total volume of all real solutions. This generalizes a previous result due to Mahler for the case $n = 2$. Further, we prove a conjecture of W. M. Schmidt, showing that for F of finite type the number of integral solutions is bounded above by $c(n, d)m^{n/d}$, where $c(n, d)$ is an effectively computable constant depending only on n and d .

Introduction

In this paper we consider forms in $n > 1$ variables of the type $F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d L_i(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{X}]$, where each $L_i(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{X}]$ is a linear form. For a positive integer m we are interested in the integer solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ to the inequality

$$(1) \quad |F(\mathbf{x})| \leq m.$$

Consider the case when $n = 2$, $d > n$ and $F(\mathbf{X})$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$. Thue's famous result in [T] is that the number of integer solutions to (1) in this case is finite. Later, Mahler in [M] estimated the number $N_F(m)$ of such solutions as follows. Let $A(F)$ denote the area of the planar region $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2: |F(\mathbf{x})| \leq 1\}$, so that $m^{2/d}A(F)$ is the measure of the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that satisfy (1). (The hypothesis that F is irreducible forces the discriminant

*Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9800859.

to be nonzero, which implies that this area is finite.) Then

$$\left| N_F(m) - m^{2/d} A(F) \right| = O(m^{1/(d-1)})$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where the implicit constants depend on d and F . We also have a result due to Schmidt [S3, Chap. III, Theorem 1C] which states that for irreducible F , $N_F(m) \ll dm^{2/d}(1 + \log m^{1/d})$ with an absolute implicit constant.

Other than results for the case $n = 2$, little has been published on this question. Ramachandra in [R] proved that for norm forms of the type $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(X_1 + \alpha X_2 + \cdots + \alpha^{n-1} X_n)$, where $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ is a number field of degree $d \geq 8n^6$ and $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes the norm from K to $\mathbb{Q}$, one has

$$|N_F(m) - m^{n/d} V(F)| = O(m^{\varepsilon + (n-1)/(d-n+2)})$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where the implicit constant depends on both F and ε , and $V(F)$ denotes the volume analogous to the area $A(F)$ above. Note that by the homogeneity of F , $m^{n/d} V(F)$ is the volume of the set of all real solutions to (1). Of course, one needs the subspace theorem to approach the general case. For norm forms, Schmidt showed in [S1] that the number of solutions to (1) is finite for all m if and only if F is a nondegenerate. Evertse has shown in [E3] that for nondegenerate norm forms F of degree d in n variables, one has

$$N_F(m) \leq (16d)^{\frac{1}{3}(n+7)^3} m^{(n + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} i^{-1})/d} \times (1 + \log m)^{\frac{1}{2}n(n+1)}.$$

The results above are of two different flavors. On the one hand the natural heuristic is that, in the absence of a compelling reason to the contrary, one expects that the volume of the region in $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined by (1) should approximate the number of integral solutions to (1). The results of Mahler and Ramachandra above verify this in special cases. On the other hand, when $N_F(m)$ is finite one expects that it should be bounded above by a function independent of the specific coefficients of F . This was proven by Evertse in [E1] for the case $n = 2$, and another result of Schmidt in [S2] confirms this in the general case of products of nondegenerate norm forms. Schmidt's absolute upper bound above in the case $n = 2$ appears to be the right order of magnitude in terms of m (up to the logarithmic term). In fact, in [S2] Schmidt makes the conjecture that $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$ for all nondegenerate norm forms of degree d in n variables, where the implicit constant depends only on n and d . Evertse's result above comes close to this.

When one tries to reconcile the heuristic with Schmidt's conjecture, one is led to the conjecture that $V(F) \ll 1$ for nondegenerate norm forms. This was shown to be true in [B] for the case $n = 2$, and was shown to be true for general forms in $d > n$ variables with nonzero discriminant in [BT].

Returning to our heuristic, what would be a "compelling reason" for $N_F(m)$ to *not* be approximated by the volume? One such reason comes immediately to mind. It is typically the case that, though the volume $V(F)$ may

be finite, the lower dimensional volume of the region defined by (1) cut by a hyperplane is infinite. If such a hyperplane were defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, then that rational hyperplane might contain infinitely many integral points. With this in mind, we say F is of *finite type* if $V(F)$ is finite, and the same is true for F restricted to any nontrivial rational subspace. Note in particular that if F is of finite type, it does not vanish at any nonzero rational point. When F is of finite type, then, we rule out this “compelling reason.” Since $N_F(m)$ can be infinite if F is a degenerate norm form, this could be a “compelling reason” as well. But degeneracy of a norm form is a rather algebraic concept, and it is not immediately clear what the connection is between this and the more geometric concept of the volume $V(F)$.

The purpose of this paper is to answer the following questions: When is $V(F)$ finite? More correctly, can one determine rather simply from a given factorization of F whether $V(F)$ is finite or not? If $V(F)$ is finite, is $V(F) \ll 1$? When is $N_F(m)$ finite for all m ? If $N_F(m)$ is finite, is it approximated by $m^{n/d}V(F)$? If $N_F(m)$ is finite, is $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$? We will prove Schmidt’s conjecture and more. Here and from now on, all implicit constants in the $\ll$ notation depend only (and explicitly) on n and d .

THEOREM 1. *Let F be a decomposable form of degree d in n variables with integral coefficients. If $V(F)$ is finite and F does not vanish at a nonzero integral point, then $V(F) \ll 1$.*

THEOREM 2. *Let F be a decomposable form of degree d in n variables with integral coefficients. Then $N_F(m)$ is finite for all m if and only if F is of finite type. If F is of finite type, then $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$.*

Apparently nondegenerate norm forms are of finite type. This could be shown more directly, though it is not a simple consequence of the definition of nondegenerate. The answer to our question regarding the finiteness of $V(F)$ requires further notation, so we leave it for the next section (see the proposition below). We only remark here that it is necessary that $d > n$ in order for $V(F)$ to be finite except for the case of a positive definite quadratic form in two variables.

THEOREM 3. *Let F be decomposable form of degree d in n variables with integral coefficients. If F is of finite type, then there are $a(F), c(F) \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying*

$$1 \leq a(F) \leq \frac{d}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)}$$

and

$$\frac{(d-n)}{d} \leq c(F) < \binom{d}{n}(d-n+1)$$

such that

$$|N_F(m) - m^{n/d} V(F)| \ll m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}.$$

If the discriminant is not zero, then we may take $a(F) = 1$ and $c(F) = \binom{d-1}{n-1} - 1$.

The quantities $a(F)$, $c(F)$ and $\mathcal{H}(F)$ appearing in Theorem 3 are explicitly defined in the next section. Note that $(n-1)/(d-a(F)) < n/d$ in Theorem 3, so that the estimate for $N_F(m)$ given is not trivial. Theorem 3 is a broad generalization of Mahler's result above.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 introduces some notation and defines some quantities connected to F which will be used throughout. In the next section we derive some general results concerning the height $\mathcal{H}(F)$. Sections 3 and 4 are the technical heart of the paper where we see that solutions to (1) lie in subsets of certain convex regions (these regions are parallelopipeds if F factors over $\mathbb{R}$) and we garner pertinent information about these convex regions. Section 5 deals with the case when $V(F)$ is infinite. The next two sections are devoted to estimating volumes connected with (1) and analyzing the set of integral solutions to (1). The proofs of our theorems follow in the last section, using an inductive argument on the number of variables n .

1. Definitions and a linear programming result

Throughout the rest of this paper, $F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d L_i(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{X}]$ will denote a decomposable form of degree d in n variables with integral coefficients and $m \geq 1$ will be a fixed real number. The case where F is a power of a positive definite quadratic form in two variables is exceptional and our questions posed in the introduction are trivially answered in this case, so from now on we will assume that F is not such a form.

We will use the notion of “equivalent forms.” If F is a decomposable form in n variables and $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, then we can compose F with T to get a new form $G(\mathbf{X}) = F \circ T(\mathbf{X})$. Since $\det(T) = \pm 1$, we have $V(F) = V(G)$. Further, the integral solutions to (1) are in one-to-one correspondence (via T^{-1}) with the integral solutions to $|G(\mathbf{x})| \leq m$. Because of this, we say two forms F and G are equivalent if there is a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with $G = F \circ T$. The freedom to choose a representative from each equivalence class will be used to our advantage.

We now proceed with some definitions and notation. We will denote the usual L_2 norm of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ by $\|\mathbf{x}\|$. We will denote the coefficient vector of a linear form $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ by $\mathbf{L}_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Complex conjugation will be denoted by an overline: $\overline{\alpha}$. This notation will be extended to vectors as well, e.g., $\overline{\mathbf{L}}$. Elements

of $\mathbb{C}^n$ will be viewed as $1 \times n$ matrices (i.e., row vectors) and a superscript tr will denote the transpose of a matrix, so that $\mathbf{L}^{tr}$ is a column vector for a coefficient vector $\mathbf{L}$.

We define the *height* of F to be

$$\mathcal{H}(F) := \prod_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{L}_i\|.$$

Note that $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is actually independent of the particular factorization of F used, though it is not preserved under equivalence.

Given a factorization of F , let $I(F)$ denote the set of all ordered n -tuples $(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n})$ of linearly independent coefficient vectors. We let $b(\mathbf{L}_i)$ denote the number of n -tuples in $I(F)$ where $\mathbf{L}_i$ occurs and let $b(F)$ denote the maximum of these $b(\mathbf{L}_i)$. Note that $b(F)$ is preserved under equivalence and is independent of the factorization used. Let $I'(F) \subset I(F)$ denote those n -tuples with $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n$. Letting $|\cdot|$ denote the cardinality, we have

$$(2) \quad |I(F)| = n!|I'(F)| \leq n! \binom{d}{n},$$

with equality if and only if the discriminant of F is not zero.

Let $J(F)$ be the subset of $I(F)$ consisting of n -tuples that satisfy the following restriction: if $j < n$, then either $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j+1}}$ is proportional to $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$ or $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$ is in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$. If $J(F)$ is not empty, we let

$$a(F) = \max \left\{ \frac{\text{the number of } \mathbf{L}_i \text{ in the span of } \mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}}{j} \right\},$$

where the maximum is over all n -tuples in $J(F)$ and $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. If $J(F)$ is empty, we leave $a(F)$ undefined. Note that the number of factors in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}$ is d for all n -tuples in $I(F)$. We will see later (see Lemma 5 below) that $J(F)$ is in fact empty only when $I(F)$ is. Note that $a(F) \geq 1$ if it is defined, with equality if and only if the discriminant of F is not zero.

We can now state our characterization of finite volume in terms of the factorization of F .

PROPOSITION. *For a decomposable form F as above, $V(F)$ is finite if and only if $a(F)$ is defined and less than d/n .*

The proposition will be proven in Section 7 below.

We now continue with some definitions. Let

$$c(F) = \begin{cases} \binom{d-1}{n-1} - 1 & \text{if the discriminant of } F \text{ is not zero,} \\ \frac{b(F)}{n!a(F)}(d - (n-1)a(F)) - \frac{1}{a(F)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

whenever $a(F)$ is defined. This quantity occurs as an exponent on $\mathcal{H}(F)$ in our arguments; we give it a name for notational convenience.

The *semi-discriminant* of F , which we denote by $S(F)$, is given by

$$S(F) := \prod \det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr}),$$

where the product is over all n -tuples in $I(F)$ when $I(F)$ is not empty, and $S(F) = 0$ otherwise. Unlike $\mathcal{H}(F)$, the semi-discriminant can be dependent on the factorization. If

$$F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d L_i(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d \alpha_i L_i(\mathbf{X})$$

are two different factorizations of F , then the semi-discriminant for the first will equal that for the second if and only if

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^{b(\mathbf{L}_i)} = 1.$$

Hence, the semi-discriminant is independent of the factorization if and only if $b(\mathbf{L}_i) = b(F)$ for all i . This is not always the case, as the example $F(\mathbf{X}) = X_1^2 X_2 X_3 \cdots X_n$ shows. To deal with this nonuniqueness, we introduce a quantity which we call the *normalized semi-discriminant*, denoted by $NS(F)$ and defined by

$$NS(F) := \prod \frac{\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\| \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_{i_n}\|} = \frac{S(F)}{\|\mathbf{L}_1\|^{b(\mathbf{L}_1)} \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_d\|^{b(\mathbf{L}_d)}},$$

where the product is over all n -tuples in $I(F)$. Then $|NS(F)|$ is entirely determined by the form F . It is not preserved under equivalence.

We end this section with a simple linear programming result which will be needed later.

LEMMA 1. *Let k be a positive integer. Let $b_1 \leq \cdots \leq b_k$ be a nondecreasing sequence of real numbers and let $A > 0$. Then the minimum value of $x_1 b_1 + \cdots + x_k b_k$ subject to the restrictions*

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &\geq 0 && \text{all } i, \\ x_1 + \cdots + x_j &\leq jA && \text{all } j, \\ x_1 + \cdots + x_k &= kA, \end{aligned}$$

is achieved when $x_i = A$ for all i .

Proof. We prove this by induction on k . The case $k = 1$ is trivial, so assume $k > 1$.

Suppose $x_1, \dots, x_k$ satisfy the restrictions given. Let i be minimal such that $x_i > 0$. If $i > 1$, then

$$x'_j = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } j \neq i, i-1, \\ x_i/2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

also satisfy the restrictions, and $x_1b_1 + \cdots + x_nb_n \geq x'_1b_1 + \cdots + x'_nb_n$ since $b_{i-1} \leq b_i$. This shows that there is a solution to our problem where $x_1 > 0$. On the other hand, it is well known that any solution to such a problem occurs at a vertex of the convex region determined by the restrictions. Such a vertex has $x_1 = 0$ or A , so the minimum can be achieved when $x_1 = A$.

We now invoke the induction hypothesis, which says that the minimum value of $x_2b_2 + \cdots + x_kb_k$ subject to the restrictions

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &\geq 0 && \text{all } i > 1, \\ x_2 + \cdots + x_j &\leq (j-1)A && \text{all } j > 1, \\ x_2 + \cdots + x_k &= (k-1)A, \end{aligned}$$

is achieved when $x_i = A$ for all $i > 1$.

2. Inequalities involving the height

LEMMA 2. *For any factor $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ of $F(\mathbf{X})$, $\mathbf{L}_i$ is proportional to a vector $\mathbf{L}'_i$ with algebraic coefficients in a number field of degree no greater than d , and the field height $H(\mathbf{L}'_i)$ satisfies $H(\mathbf{L}'_i) \leq \mathcal{H}(F)$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}(F) \geq 1$.*

See [S3] for a definition of $H(\mathbf{L})$. This is the usual field height (not absolute height) using L_2 norms at the infinite places.

Proof. Suppose first that F is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$. It is known that $F(\mathbf{X}) = aN_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(L(\mathbf{X}))$, where a is a nonzero rational number, K is a number field of degree equal to the degree of F and $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes the norm from K to $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus, any factor of F is proportional to some conjugate of $L(\mathbf{X})$. The coefficient vectors of these conjugates all have the same field height (see the remark on p. 23 of [S3]). Further, by [S3 Chap. III, Lemma 2A], $\mathcal{H}(F) = \text{cont}(F)H(\mathbf{L})$, where $\text{cont}(F)$ denotes the content of F . Since the content of F is a positive integer, we get $H(\mathbf{L}) \leq \mathcal{H}(F)$. Since the field height function $H \geq 1$, the lemma is true when F is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.

In general,

$$F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{l=1}^k F_l(\mathbf{X}),$$

where each F_l is a form with integral coefficients which is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$. Any linear factor $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ of F is a factor of some F_{l_i} . By what we have shown, $\mathbf{L}_i$ is proportional to an $\mathbf{L}'_i$ with algebraic coefficients in a number field of degree no greater than the degree of F_{l_i} and satisfying $H(\mathbf{L}'_i) \leq \mathcal{H}(F_{l_i})$. The

degree of F_{l_i} is certainly no larger than the degree of F , and

$$\mathcal{H}(F) = \prod_{l=1}^k \mathcal{H}(F_l).$$

We have shown that $\mathcal{H}(F_l) \geq 1$ for all l , so $\mathcal{H}(F) \geq \mathcal{H}(F_{l_i})$ and the lemma is proven.

LEMMA 3. *If $I(F)$ is not empty, then*

$$|NS(F)| \geq \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)}.$$

For any n -tuple in $I(F)$ we have

$$(3) \quad \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \geq \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)/n!}.$$

Proof. Since $|NS(F)|$ is independent of the factorization used, we may choose any one we wish. First factor F into a product of forms with integral coefficients which are irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$,

$$F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{l=1}^k F_l(\mathbf{X}),$$

as in the proof of Lemma 2 above. Write each $F_l(\mathbf{X})$ as a rational multiple of a norm form as above in the proof of Lemma 2.

Since F has rational coefficients, it is invariant under any element σ of the Galois group of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Thus, any element of the Galois group must take our factorization of F to another, say

$$\sigma(\mathbf{L}_i) = \beta_i \mathbf{L}_{\sigma'(i)},$$

where $\beta_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and σ' is an element of the permutation group of $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Also, $\sigma(S(F))$ is equal to the semi-discriminant with this factorization given by σ . For any n -tuple $(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}) \in I(F)$,

$$0 \neq \sigma(\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})) = \det(\mathbf{L}_{\sigma'(i_1)}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{\sigma'(i_n)}^{tr}) \times \prod_{j=1}^n \beta_{i_j}.$$

Since σ' is a permutation, in this manner we see that $b(\mathbf{L}_i) = b(\mathbf{L}_{\sigma'(i)})$ for any i . But the Galois group acts transitively on the factors of norm forms, so we conclude that $b(\mathbf{L}_i) = b(\mathbf{L}_j)$ whenever $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ and $L_j(\mathbf{X})$ are factors of the same irreducible $F_l(\mathbf{X})$, i.e., all the linear factors of a given F_l have the same b value. Let b_l denote the b value of the linear factors of F_l for each $l = 1, \dots, k$.

Suppose $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{d'}}$ are the coefficient vectors of the linear factors of some F_l . Just like $F(\mathbf{X})$, $F_l(\mathbf{X})$ has integral coefficients and is invariant under σ . Hence,

$$\prod_{j=1}^{d'} \beta_{i_j} = 1 = \prod_{j=1}^{d'} \beta_{i_j}^{b_l}.$$

Taking into account the different factors F_l of F , we are led to

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \beta_i^{b(\mathbf{L}_{\sigma'(i)})} = 1.$$

As remarked in Section 1, this shows that the semi-discriminant $S(F)$ is the same for our initial factorization of F and the factorization induced by σ . So our $S(F)$ is invariant under the Galois group of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, and hence a rational number. It is nonzero since $I(F)$ is not empty.

Let v be any place of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then Hadamard's inequality gives

$$\frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|_v}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\|_v \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_{i_n}\|_v} \leq 1,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_v$ denotes the usual L_2 norm if $v|\infty$ and the sup norm otherwise. In particular,

$$(4) \quad |S(F)|_v \leq \prod_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{L}_i\|_v^{b(\mathbf{L}_i)}.$$

By the definition of b_l we have

$$(5) \quad \prod_{i=1}^d L_i(\mathbf{X})^{b(\mathbf{L}_i)} = F_1(\mathbf{X})^{b_1} \cdots F_k(\mathbf{X})^{b_k}.$$

We let $\mathbf{F}_l$ denote the coefficient vector of F_l for each $l = 1, \dots, k$. If v is non-archimedean, then Gauss' lemma together with (4) and (5) gives

$$|S(F)|_v \leq \prod_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{L}_i\|_v^{b(\mathbf{L}_i)} = \|\mathbf{F}_1\|_v^{b_1} \cdots \|\mathbf{F}_k\|_v^{b_k} \leq 1.$$

This holds for any non-archimedean place, so $|S(F)|$ is a positive integer. In particular, $|S(F)| \geq 1$. By Lemma 3, $\mathcal{H}(F_l) \geq 1$ for all l , so that by (5)

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{L}_i\|^{b(\mathbf{L}_i)} = \mathcal{H}(F_1)^{b_1} \cdots \mathcal{H}(F_k)^{b_k} \leq \mathcal{H}(F_1)^{b(F)} \cdots \mathcal{H}(F_l)^{b(F)} = \mathcal{H}(F)^{b(F)}.$$

Hence $|NS(F)| \geq \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)}$ with this factorization of F .

As for (3), we note that

$$|NS(F)|^{1/n!} = \prod \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \geq \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)/n!},$$

where the product is over all n -tuples of $I'(F)$. We saw above that each factor in this middle product is no greater than 1, thus each factor is bounded below by our lower bound for $|NS(F)|^{1/n!}$.

3. Bounds for linear factors

In this section our goal is to show that for any solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of (1), there is an n -tuple in $I(F)$ with the product $|L_{i_1}(\mathbf{x})| \cdots |L_{i_n}(\mathbf{x})|$ relatively small. We start with a general result which says that n linearly independent linear forms cannot simultaneously be small at $\mathbf{x}$.

LEMMA 4. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and let $L_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, L_n(\mathbf{X})$ be n linearly independent linear forms. Suppose that*

$$\frac{|L_j(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_j\|} \geq \frac{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_i\|}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then

$$\frac{|L_j(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_j\|} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\| |\det(\mathbf{L}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_n^{tr})|}{n^{n/2} \prod_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_i\|}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $\|\mathbf{L}_i\| = 1$ for all i and $\|\mathbf{x}\| = 1$. Let T denote the $n \times n$ matrix with rows $\mathbf{L}_i$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m} &= \min_{\|\mathbf{y}\|=1} \{\|T\mathbf{y}^{tr}\|\} \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{M} &= \max_{\|\mathbf{y}\|=1} \{\|T\mathbf{y}^{tr}\|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\|T\mathbf{x}_1^{tr}\| = \mathfrak{m}$ and $\|\mathbf{x}_1\| = 1$. Choose $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, all of length 1, that also satisfy $|\det(\mathbf{x}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{tr})| = 1$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(T)| &= |\det(T)| |\det(\mathbf{x}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{tr})| = |\det(T\mathbf{x}_1^{tr}, \dots, T\mathbf{x}_n^{tr})| \\ &\leq \prod_{l=1}^n \|T\mathbf{x}_l^{tr}\| \\ &\leq \mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{M}^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{L}_i\| = 1$ for all i we have $\mathfrak{M} \leq \sqrt{n}$, so that

$$\mathfrak{m} \geq n^{(1-n)/2} |\det(T)|.$$

By the hypothesis, $|L_j(\mathbf{x})| \geq |L_i(\mathbf{x})|$ for all i , so that

$$\sqrt{n}|L_j(\mathbf{x})| \geq \|T\mathbf{x}^{tr}\| \geq \mathfrak{m}.$$

Combining these last two inequalities yields the lemma.

LEMMA 5. Suppose $I(F)$ is not empty. Then $a(F)$ is defined. If $a(F) < d/n$, then for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is an n -tuple in $J(F)$ such that

$$(6) \quad \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \ll \left(\frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}.$$

Proof. Suppose $I(F)$ is not empty and let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We define minima $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ and choose indices $i_1, \dots, i_n$ as follows. Let

$$\lambda_1 = \min\{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|/\|\mathbf{L}_i\|\},$$

where the minimum is over all factors $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ of $F(\mathbf{X})$. Choose i_1 such that

$$|L_{i_1}(\mathbf{x})|/\|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\| = \lambda_1.$$

We then continue recursively, letting

$$\lambda_{j+1} = \min\{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|/\|\mathbf{L}_i\|\} \geq \lambda_j,$$

where the minimum is over all factors $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ where $\mathbf{L}_i$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. We choose i_{j+1} such that $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j+1}}$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ and

$$|L_{i_{j+1}}(\mathbf{x})|/\|\mathbf{L}_{i_{j+1}}\| = \lambda_{j+1},$$

with the stipulation that $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j+1}}$ is proportional to $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$ if $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$. (Note that if this were the case, then $\lambda_{j+1} = \lambda_j$, so that such a choice for i_{j+1} is possible.) These minima are well defined since $I(F)$ is not empty, implying that the set of all $\mathbf{L}_i$ has rank n . By construction, $(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}) \in J(F)$, so $a(F)$ is defined.

Now suppose $a(F) < d/n$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $F(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, then (6) trivially holds since $\lambda_1 = 0$. So we may as well assume $F(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$, which implies that $\lambda_1 > 0$. Let a_1 be the number of $\mathbf{L}_i$ which are linearly dependent on $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$. For $j > 1$ let a_j be the number of $\mathbf{L}_i$ which are in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ but not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j-1}}$. If $\mathbf{L}_i$ is in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ but not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j-1}}$, then $|L_i(\mathbf{x})|/\|\mathbf{L}_i\| \geq \lambda_j$ by the definition of λ_j . Thus,

$$(7) \quad \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\mathcal{H}(F)} = \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_i\|} \geq \prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{a_j}.$$

By definition, $a_1 + \dots + a_j$ is the number of $\mathbf{L}_i$ in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. This implies that

$$(8) \quad a_1 + \dots + a_j \leq ja(F) \quad 1 \leq j < n$$

and $a_1 + \cdots + a_n = d$. Let $s = a_1 + \cdots + a_{n-1}$, so $s \leq (n-1)a(F)$ by (8). Since $\lambda_n \geq \lambda_{n-1}$, we see that

$$\lambda_n^{a_n} \lambda_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}} \geq \lambda_n^{a_n - ((n-1)a(F) - s)} \lambda_{n-1}^{a_{n-1} + ((n-1)a(F) - s)}.$$

Define a'_j by

$$a'_j = \begin{cases} a_n - ((n-1)a(F) - s) = d - (n-1)a(F) & \text{for } j = n, \\ a_{n-1} + ((n-1)a(F) - s) & \text{for } j = n-1, \\ a_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then (7) and (8) hold with a'_j in place of a_j , and also

$$(9) \quad a'_1 + \cdots + a'_{n-1} = (n-1)a(F).$$

Because of (8) and (9), we can use Lemma 1 with $k = n-1$, $b_j = \log \lambda_j$ and $A = a(F)$. We get

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j^{a'_j} \geq \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j^{a(F)}.$$

This and (7) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\mathcal{H}(F)} &= \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_i\|} \geq \prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{a'_j} \\ &= \lambda_n^{d-na(F)+a(F)} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j^{a'_j} \\ &\geq \lambda_n^{d-na(F)} \prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{a(F)} \\ &= \lambda_n^{d-na(F)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \right)^{a(F)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4,

$$\lambda_n = \frac{|L_{i_n}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_n}\|} \gg \|\mathbf{x}\| \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|}.$$

So by (3)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\mathcal{H}(F)} &\geq \lambda_n^{d-na(F)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \right)^{a(F)} \\
 &\gg \|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)} \left(\frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \right)^{d-na(F)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \right)^{a(F)} \\
 &= \|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)} \left(\frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}{\prod_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \right)^{d-(n-1)a(F)} \\
 &\quad \times \left(\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \right)^{a(F)} \\
 &\geq \|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)} (d-(n-1)a(F)) / n! \left(\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \right)^{a(F)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves (6) in the case where the discriminant is zero.

When the discriminant is not zero we can do somewhat better. First of all, we have $a(F) = 1$. Letting $L_{i_1}, \dots, L_{i_n}$ be as above, we see that

$$\frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\mathcal{H}(F)} \geq \prod_{l \neq i_1, \dots, i_n} \frac{|L_l(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_l\|} \times \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|}.$$

By Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\mathcal{H}(F)} &\gg \prod_{l \neq i_1, \dots, i_n} \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\| \cdot |\det(\mathbf{L}_l^{tr}, \mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}^{tr})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_l\| \cdot \|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\| \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}\|} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_{i_j}\|} \\
 &= \|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-n} \prod_{l \neq i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}} \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_l^{tr}, \mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}^{tr})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_l\| \cdot \|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\| \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}\|} \times \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}.
 \end{aligned}$$

As with (3), Hadamard's inequality and our bound for $|NS(F)|$ in Lemma 3 give

$$\prod_{l \neq i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}} \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_l^{tr}, \mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}^{tr})|}{\|\mathbf{L}_l\| \cdot \|\mathbf{L}_{i_1}\| \cdots \|\mathbf{L}_{i_{n-1}}\|} \geq |NS(F)|^{1/n!} \geq \mathcal{H}(F)^{-b(F)/n!}.$$

Since the discriminant is not zero, each $\mathbf{L}_i$ occurs in the same number of n -tuples in $I(F)$, i.e., $b(\mathbf{L}_i) = b(F)$ for each i . Hence

$$db(F) = \sum_{i=1}^d b(\mathbf{L}_i) = n|I(F)|.$$

By (2) then,

$$\frac{b(F)}{n!} = \frac{n|I(F)|}{dn!} = \frac{n}{d} \binom{d}{n} = \binom{d-1}{n-1}.$$

This proves the case when the discriminant is not zero.

The estimate in Lemma 5 is not so good when $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is large in comparison to m or $\|\mathbf{x}\|$. In such a situation we will use the following, which generalizes [S3 Chap. IV, Lemma 6A].

LEMMA 6. *Suppose $I(F)$ is not empty and $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is minimal among forms equivalent to F . Suppose further that F does not vanish at any nonzero integral point. Then for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is an n -tuple in $I'(F)$ with*

$$\frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|^{n/d}}{\mathcal{H}(F)^{1/d}} \gg \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|}.$$

Proof. If $F(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ the statement is trivial, so assume otherwise. By homogeneity of the quantities

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|},$$

we may use any factorization of F . Let $F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{l=1}^k F_l(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d L_i(\mathbf{X})$ be the factorization of F in the proof of Lemma 3, and introduce a new factorization $F(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{i=1}^d L'_i(\mathbf{X})$ given by

$$L'_i(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|^{1/d}}{|L_i(\mathbf{x})|} L_i(\mathbf{X})$$

for each i . By hypothesis,

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{H}(F \circ T) \geq \mathcal{H}(F) = \prod_{i=1}^d \|\mathbf{L}'_i\|$$

for any $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$.

There are r_1 real linear factors and r_2 pairs of complex conjugate linear factors of F , say. Arrange the indices so that $\mathbf{L}'_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $i \leq r_1$, $\mathbf{L}'_i \in \mathbb{C}^n$ for $r_1 < i \leq d = r_1 + 2r_2$ and $\mathbf{L}'_{i+r_2} = \overline{\mathbf{L}'_i}$ for $r_1 < i \leq r_1 + r_2$. Let $\mathbb{E}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \oplus \mathbb{C}^{2r_2}$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ where $x_{i+r_2} = \overline{x_i}$ for $r_1 < i \leq r_1 + r_2$. Then $\mathbb{E}^d$ is d -dimensional Euclidean space via the usual hermitian inner product on $\mathbb{C}^d$.

Let M be the $d \times n$ matrix given by

$$M := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}'_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{L}'_d \end{pmatrix} = (\mathbf{m}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_n^{tr}).$$

Then $\mathbf{m}_j \in \mathbb{E}^d$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover,

$$(11) \quad \|\wedge_{j=1}^n \mathbf{m}_j\|^2 = \sum_{I'(F)} |\det((\mathbf{L}'_{i_1})^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{L}'_{i_n})^{tr})|^2,$$

where the sum is over all n -tuples in $I'(F)$. The interplay between (10) and (11) which deal with lengths of the rows and columns of M , respectively, will be used to get our result.

Let $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the successive minima of the n -dimensional lattice $\Lambda = \oplus_{j=1}^n \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{m}_j \subset \mathbb{E}^d$ with respect to the unit ball. Then by Minkowski's theorem,

$$(12) \quad \lambda_1^2 \cdots \lambda_n^2 \ll \det(\Lambda)^2 = \|\wedge_{j=1}^n \mathbf{m}_j\|^2.$$

We need a lower bound for $\lambda_1^2 \cdots \lambda_n^2$. We first get a lower bound on $\lambda_1^2 \cdots \lambda_{n-1}^2$. We then get a lower bound on λ_n and finish the proof.

Let $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ be a basis for Λ satisfying $\|\mathbf{z}_j\| \leq j\lambda_j$ for each j . Write

$$MT = (\mathbf{z}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n^{tr}),$$

where

$$T = (\mathbf{a}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n^{tr}) \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z}),$$

and write $\mathbf{z}_j = (z_{j,1}, \dots, z_{j,d})$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Note that $z_{j,i} = L'_i(\mathbf{a}_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Since $F(\mathbf{a}_1) \neq 0$ by construction, we have $|F(\mathbf{a}_1)| \geq 1$. The arithmetic-geometric inequality thus gives

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_1)^2 &\geq \|\mathbf{z}_1\|^2 \geq d \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |z_{1,i_j}|^2 \right)^{1/d} \\ &= d \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |L'_{i_j}(\mathbf{a}_1)| \right)^{2/d} \\ &= d (|F(\mathbf{a}_1)|)^{2/d} \\ &\geq d. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(13) \quad \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j^2 \geq \lambda_1^{2(n-1)} \geq 1.$$

We need a better bound for λ_n . For this, we use another application of the arithmetic-geometric inequality together with (10), getting

$$\begin{aligned}
 n^3 \lambda_n^2 &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n (j \lambda_j)^2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \|\mathbf{z}_j\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^d |z_{j,i}|^2 \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^n |z_{j,i}|^2 \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^d \|(z_{1,i}, \dots, z_{n,i})\|^2 \\
 &\geq d \left(\prod_{i=1}^d \|(z_{1,i}, \dots, z_{n,i})\|^2 \right)^{1/d} \\
 &= d (\mathcal{H}(F \circ T))^{2/d} \\
 &\geq d (\mathcal{H}(F))^{2/d}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Our bound for λ_n together with the bound (13) yields

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2 \geq n^{-3} d \mathcal{H}(F)^{2/d}.$$

By (11) and (12), we get

$$\sum_{I'(F)} |\det((\mathbf{L}'_{i_1})^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{L}'_{i_n})^{tr})|^2 \gg \mathcal{H}(F)^{2/d}.$$

There are no more than $\binom{d}{n}$ summands here by (2). The largest summand thus satisfies

$$|\det((\mathbf{L}'_{i_1})^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{L}'_{i_n})^{tr})| \gg \mathcal{H}(F)^{1/d}.$$

Finally, we have

$$|\det((\mathbf{L}'_{i_1})^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{L}'_{i_n})^{tr})| = \frac{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})| \cdot |F(\mathbf{x})|^{n/d}}{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}.$$

4. Auxiliary results

By Lemmas 5 and 6, any solution to (1) satisfies an inequality of the form

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \ll A,$$

where A is some given bound. Our goal here is to get information on the solutions to such inequalities. Specifically, we show that such solutions lie in

convex sets. Further, given bounds for the lengths of such solutions considered, there are upper bounds for the number of such convex sets. Lastly, we determine upper bounds for both the volume and the number of integral points in such convex sets.

LEMMA 7. Let $K_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, K_n(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{X}]$ be n linearly independent linear forms in n variables. Denote the corresponding coefficient vectors by $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_n$. Let $A, B, C > 0$ with $C > B$ and let $D > 1$. Consider the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

$$(14) \quad \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n |K_i(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{K}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_n^{tr})|} \leq A$$

and also $B \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$. If $BC^{n-1} \geq D^{n-1}n!n^{n/2}A$, then this set lies in the union of less than

$$n^3 \left(\log_D (BC^{n-1}/n!n^{n/2}A) \right)^{n-2}$$

convex sets of the form

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} &\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |K'_i(\mathbf{y})| \leq a_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n\}, \\ &|\det((\mathbf{K}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{K}'_n)^{tr})| = 1, \\ &\|\mathbf{K}'_i\| = 1 \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i < D^n n!n^{n/2} \frac{CA}{B}.$$

If $BC^{n-1} < D^{n-1}n!n^{n/2}A$, then this set lies in the union of no more than $n!$ convex sets of this form.

Proof. The proof of [S3 Chap. IV, Lemma 7A] shows that the solutions to (14) can be partitioned into $n!$ subsets, and for each such subset there exist pairwise orthogonal linear forms $K'_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, K'_n(\mathbf{X})$ (these depend on the subset) such that all solutions $\mathbf{x}$ in that subset satisfy

$$(14') \quad \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n |K'_i(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det((\mathbf{K}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{K}'_n)^{tr})|} \leq n!A.$$

After possibly rescaling, we may assume that $\|\mathbf{K}'_i\| = 1$ for each i . This implies the modulus of the determinant is 1 as well.

Let $\mathbf{x}$ be a solution to (14') of length at least B . By Lemma 4, for some i_0 (depending on $\mathbf{x}$, of course) we have $|K_{i_0}(\mathbf{x})| \geq n^{-n/2}B$. This leaves us with

$$\prod_{i \neq i_0} |K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq \frac{n!n^{n/2}A}{B}.$$

Write $|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| = D^{-n_i}C$ for each $i \neq i_0$. If $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$, then $n_i \geq 0$, and by the above estimate $\sum_{i \neq i_0} n_i \geq \log_D (BC^{n-1}/n^{n/2}n!A)$. Let $[\cdot]$ denote the greatest integer function. Then

$$\sum_{i \neq i_0} [n_i] > \sum_{i \neq i_0} (n_i - 1) \geq \log_D \left(\frac{BC^{n-1}}{D^{n-1}n!n^{n/2}A} \right).$$

For the time being, denote the quantity $\log_D \left(\frac{BC^{n-1}}{D^{n-1}n!n^{n/2}A} \right)$ by Q . If $Q \geq 0$, then we can find nonnegative integers $z_i \leq [n_i]$ for each $i \neq i_0$ that satisfy $\sum_{i \neq i_0} z_i = [Q]$. Further, our solution $\mathbf{x}$ satisfies $|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq D^{-z_i}C$ for $i \neq i_0$ since $-z_i \geq -n_i$. To make the notation uniform, we set $z_{i_0} = 0$, so that $|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq D^{-z_i}C$ for all i . If $Q < 0$, then we simply set all $z_i = 0$.

Summarizing what we have accomplished so far, we see that the solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (14) with $B \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$ lie in the union of $n!$ subsets, and for each such subset there are pairwise orthogonal linear forms $K'_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, K'_n(\mathbf{X})$ with $\|\mathbf{K}'_i\| = 1$ such that all solutions in that subset lie in convex sets of the form

$$\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |K'_i(\mathbf{y})| \leq D^{-z_i}C \text{ for all } i\},$$

where the z_i 's are nonnegative integers, at least one of which is 0, satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = \max\{[Q], 0\}.$$

Letting $a_i = D^{-z_i}C$, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \leq C^n D^{-[Q]} < C^n D^{1-Q} = D^n n! n^{n/2} \frac{CA}{B}.$$

It remains to estimate the number n -tuples $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ which satisfy the above conditions. Towards that end, for a nonnegative integer a denote the number of n -tuples $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $z_i \geq 0$ and $\sum z_i = a$ by $f(n, a)$. Clearly $f(1, a) = 1$. We claim that

$$f(n, a) \leq \frac{(a + n - 1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}.$$

We see this by induction on n . Assuming $n \geq 2$ and our claim is true for $n - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(n, a) &= \sum_{i=0}^a f(n-1, a-i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^a \frac{(a-i+n-2)^{n-2}}{(n-2)!} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^a \frac{(j+n-2)^{n-2}}{(n-2)!} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-2)!} \int_0^{a+1} (x+n-2)^{n-2} dx \\ &\leq \frac{(a+n-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $Q \geq 0$. Then by this claim the number of n -tuples $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ of nonnegative integers with $z_{i_0} = 0$, say, satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = [Q]$ is no greater than $([Q] + n - 2)^{n-2}/(n-2)!$. (When $z_{i_0} = 0$, we use the case $n - 1$ of our claim.) Taking into account the n different possibilities for i_0 , we see that the total number of possible n -tuples we must consider is no greater than $n([Q] + n - 2)^{n-2}/(n-2)! < n(Q + n - 1)^{n-2}/(n-2)!$. Of course, if $Q < 0$ we have the one n -tuple where $z_i = 0$ for all i .

Now if $Q \geq 0$, we have

$$\frac{n(Q + n - 1)^{n-2}}{(n-2)!} = \frac{n(\log_D(BC^{n-1}/n!n^{n/2}A))^{n-2}}{(n-2)!}.$$

Also, $Q \geq 0$ if and only if $BC^{n-1} \geq D^{n-1}n!n^{n/2}A$. Taking into account the $n!$ different subsets and using $n \cdot n!/(n-2)! < n^3$ completes the proof.

We will also use the following variation of Lemma 7, which does away with the lower bound condition $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq B$ at the expense of a higher power of the logarithmic term in the number of convex sets.

LEMMA 7'. Let $K_1(\mathbf{X}), \dots, K_n(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{X}]$ and $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_n$ be as in Lemma 7. Let $A, C > 0$ and $D > 1$. If $C^n \geq D^n n!A$, then the solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (14) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$ lie in the union of less than

$$n(\log_D(C^n/n!A))^{n-1}$$

convex sets of the form (15) with

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i < D^n n!A.$$

If $C^n < D^n n!A$, then such solutions lie in the union of no more than $n!$ convex sets of this form.

Proof. The proof goes essentially the same way as for Lemma 7. The difference is that we do not invoke Lemma 4. Again we have $n!$ subsets where all solutions in the subset satisfy (14'). Let $\mathbf{x}$ be such a solution with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$ and write $|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| = D^{-n_i}C$ with $n_i \geq 0$ for each i . This time we have $\sum_{i=1}^n n_i \geq \log_D(C^n/n!A)$, so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n [n_i] > \log_D \left(\frac{C^n}{D^n n! A} \right).$$

This time denote the quantity $\log_D \left(\frac{C^n}{D^n n! A} \right)$ by Q . As before, if $Q \geq 0$, then we can find nonnegative integers $z_i \leq [n_i]$ for each i that satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = [Q]$ and our solution $\mathbf{x}$ satisfies $|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq D^{-z_i}C$ for all i . If $Q < 0$ we set all $z_i = 0$ again, so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = \max\{[Q], 0\}.$$

Set $a_i = D^{-z_i}C$ again.

We are now in the same position as with Lemma 7. The difference is that here we do not say one of the exponents z_{i_0} is zero, and

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \leq C^n D^{-[Q]} < C^n D^{1-Q} = D^n n! A.$$

Using the claim in the proof of Lemma 7, the number of n -tuples $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ of nonnegative integers satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i = [Q]$ is no greater than

$$([Q] + n - 1)^{n-1} / (n - 1)! < (Q + n)^{n-1} / (n - 1)!$$

when $Q \geq 0$. Using

$$\frac{(Q + n)^{n-1}}{(n - 1)!} = \frac{(\log_D(C^n/n!A))^{n-1}}{(n - 1)!}$$

and $Q \geq 0$ if and only if $C^n \geq D^n n! A$ completes the proof.

We need estimates for the number of integer points and also the volume of the set of all points in convex sets of the form (15). (When the $K_i(\mathbf{X})$ s are real linear forms these convex sets are simply parallelopipeds.) The following lemmas will provide the needed estimates.

LEMMA 8. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex body (convex, closed, bounded and symmetric about the origin) and let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a lattice. Suppose there are n linearly independent lattice points in $\mathcal{C}$. Then there are $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the number of lattice points in $\mathcal{C}$ is no greater than*

$$3^n 2^{n(n-1)/2} \frac{|\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})|}{\det(\Lambda)}.$$

Proof. By the homogeneity of the upper bound here we may assume $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^n$.

The proof is by induction on n . If $n = 1$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is an interval centered at the origin, say $[-y_1, y_1]$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ contains a nonzero integer point by hypothesis, we have $y_1 \geq 1$. Thus, the number of integer points in $\mathcal{C}$ is no greater than $2y_1 + 1 \leq 3y_1$.

Now assume $n > 1$ and let $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ be n linearly independent integer points in $\mathcal{C}$. Let V be the span of the first $n - 1$ of them and let $\Lambda^- = \mathbb{Z}^n \cap V$. Then Λ^- is a primitive sublattice and there is a $\mathbf{z}'_n \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\mathbb{Z}^n = \Lambda^- \oplus \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{z}'_n$.

Any integer point $\mathbf{z}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ may be written as a sum $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^- + a\mathbf{z}'_n$ where $\mathbf{z}^- \in \Lambda^-$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Further, since $\mathbf{z}_n$ is an integer point in $\mathcal{C}$ but not in V , we see that $a \neq 0$ is possible here. By Cramer's rule

$$|a| = \frac{|\det((\mathbf{z}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_{n-1})^{tr}, \mathbf{z}^{tr})|}{|\det((\mathbf{z}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_n)^{tr})|} = |\det((\mathbf{z}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_{n-1})^{tr}, \mathbf{z}^{tr})|,$$

where $\mathbf{z}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}'_{n-1}$ form a basis for Λ^- (so that $\mathbf{z}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}'_n$ is a basis for $\mathbb{Z}^n$).

For any a we estimate the number of $\mathbf{z}^- \in \Lambda^-$ with $\mathbf{z}^- + a\mathbf{z}'_n \in \mathcal{C}$ as follows. Let $\{\mathbf{z}_1^-, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N^-\}$ be the set of all such $\mathbf{z}^-$. Then the set of differences $(\mathbf{z}_i^- + a\mathbf{z}'_n) - (\mathbf{z}_1^- + a\mathbf{z}'_n)$ is a set of N distinct integer points in $\Lambda^- \cap 2\mathcal{C}$ by convexity. Note that Λ^- contains $n - 1$ linearly independent lattice points in $\mathcal{C} \cap V$, namely $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n-1}$. Thus, by the induction hypothesis there are $\mathbf{y}_1^-, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{n-1}^- \in 2\mathcal{C} \cap V$ such that the number of $\mathbf{z}^- \in \Lambda^-$ with $\mathbf{z}^- + a\mathbf{z}'_n \in \mathcal{C}$ is no greater than

$$3^{n-1}2^{(n-1)(n-2)/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_1^- \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{y}_{n-1}^-\|}{\det(\Lambda^-)}.$$

The important thing to note here is the uniformity of this bound; it does not depend on a .

Now let $|a_0|$ be maximal such that there is a $\mathbf{z}^- \in \Lambda^-$ with $\mathbf{z}^- + a_0\mathbf{z}'_n \in \mathcal{C}$ and let $\mathbf{y}_n$ be this lattice point in $\mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathbf{y}_i = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}_i^- \in \mathcal{C}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. We then have $2|a_0| + 1$ possible values of a to consider above, and we now see that the number of integer points in $\mathcal{C}$ is no greater than

$$\begin{aligned} & 3^{n-1}2^{(n-1)(n-2)/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_1^- \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{y}_{n-1}^-\|}{\det(\Lambda^-)} (2|a_0| + 1) \\ & \leq 3^{n-1}2^{(n-1)(n-2)/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_1^- \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{y}_{n-1}^-\|}{\det(\Lambda^-)} 3|a_0| \\ & = 3^n 2^{n(n-1)/2} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_1^- \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{y}_{n-1}^-\|}{\det(\Lambda^-)} |\det((\mathbf{z}'_1)^{tr}, \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_{n-1})^{tr}, (\mathbf{y}_n)^{tr})| \\ & = 3^n 2^{n(n-1)/2} |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})|. \end{aligned}$$

Though we do not need it, the proof of Lemma 8 actually shows that the $\mathbf{y}_i$'s in $\mathcal{C}$ satisfy $2^{n-i}\mathbf{y}_i \in \Lambda$ as well.

LEMMA 9. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a convex body of the form (15). Then either all integral points in $\mathcal{C}$ lie in a proper subspace, or the number of such points is no greater than*

$$3^n 2^{n(n-1)/2} n! \prod_{i=1}^n a_i.$$

The volume of $\mathcal{C}$ is no greater than

$$2^n n! \prod_{i=1}^n a_i.$$

Proof. Choose $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})|$ maximal (this is clearly possible since $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded). Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the region

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{y} = a_1 \mathbf{y}_1 + \dots + a_n \mathbf{y}_n : |a_i| \leq 1 \text{ for all } i\}.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{P} \supseteq \mathcal{C}$. Indeed, if there were a $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{P}$, then without loss of generality $\mathbf{y}_0 = \sum c_i \mathbf{y}_i$ with $c_1 > 1$. But then

$$|\det(\mathbf{y}_0^{tr}, \mathbf{y}_2^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| = |\det((c_1 \mathbf{y}_1)^{tr}, \mathbf{y}_2^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| > |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})|,$$

which contradicts the assumption on the $\mathbf{y}_i$'s. Since the volume of $\mathcal{P}$ is $2^n |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})|$, we see that there exist $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ with

$$2^n |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| \geq \text{Vol}(\mathcal{C}).$$

Finally, if we denote the $n \times n$ matrix with rows $\mathbf{K}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}'_n$ by T , then for any $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| &= |\det(\mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| \times |\det(T)| = |\det(T \mathbf{y}_1^{tr}, \dots, T \mathbf{y}_n^{tr})| \\ &\leq n! \prod_{i=1}^n \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \{ |K'_i(\mathbf{y}_j)| \} \\ &\leq n! \prod_{i=1}^n a_i. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9 follows from this estimate, the estimate given above, and Lemma 8.

5. The infinite volume case

This section is devoted entirely to showing that the volume $V(F)$ is infinite if $a(F)$ is undefined or at least d/n . This is one half of the proposition. We will also show that if $a(F)$ is undefined or at least d/n , then (1) has infinitely many integral solutions for m sufficiently large. Since none of this depends on the particular factorization of F used, we'll assume that $\overline{L_i(\mathbf{X})}$ is a factor for all i , i.e., the complex linear factors occur in conjugate pairs. We break up our argument into a series of three lemmas.

LEMMA 10. *If $a(F)$ is undefined or at least d/n , then there is a $k < n$ and k coefficient vectors $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_k}$ which satisfy the following conditions:*

- 1) *they are linearly independent;*
- 2) *there are at least kd/n coefficient vectors $\mathbf{L}_i$ in their span;*
- 3) *for all indices j , if $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$, then $j < k$ and $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j+1}} = \overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_j}}$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $a(F)$ is undefined. Then by Lemma 5 $I(F)$ is empty, i.e., the rank of $(\mathbf{L}_1^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_d^{tr})$ is less than n . Let k be this rank. Choose an $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$. If $k = 1$, then all $\mathbf{L}_i$, in particular $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_1}}$, are in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$. If $k > 1$, then choose an $\mathbf{L}_{i_2}$ which is linearly independent of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$, with the stipulation that $\mathbf{L}_{i_2} = \overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_1}}$ if this is a possible choice. Continue on in this fashion, getting $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_k}$. They satisfy conditions 1 and 3 by construction. There are $d > kd/n$ factors in their span, so condition 2 is satisfied as well.

Now suppose that $a(F)$ is defined and at least d/n . Then there is an n -tuple $(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}) \in J(F)$ and a $j < n$ where $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ have at least jd/n coefficient vectors in their span (by the definition of $a(F)$). Let j_0 be the least such index where this is true. By the definition of $J(F)$, if $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}}$ is in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$, then these j_0 coefficient vectors satisfy all three conditions above with $k = j_0$.

Suppose $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}}$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$. If $j_0 = 1$, then there are at least d/n coefficient vectors $\mathbf{L}_i \notin \mathbb{R}^n$ proportional to $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$ and at least d/n additional coefficient vectors $\overline{\mathbf{L}_i}$ proportional to $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_1}}$. In this case we let $k = 2$ and use $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_1}}$. (Note that $n > 2$ since F is assumed not to be a power of a positive definite quadratic form in two variables.) Now suppose $j_0 > 1$. Note that condition 3 is still satisfied for all $j < j_0$ by the definition of $J(F)$. Also, by the minimality of j_0 , there are fewer than $(j_0 - 1)d/n$ coefficient vectors in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0-1}}$. Consider for a moment the collection of $\mathbf{L}_i$ which are not in the span of these $j_0 - 1$ coefficient vectors, but are in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$. We could replace $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$ with any of these and the span would remain the same. If $\overline{\mathbf{L}_i}$ is in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$ for one of these $\mathbf{L}_i$, then we replace $\mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$ with $\mathbf{L}_i$ and let $k = j_0$ as above. If not, then there are more than $(j_0 d/n) - (j_0 - 1)d/n = d/n$ of these $\mathbf{L}_i$, so there are more than d/n coefficient vectors $\overline{\mathbf{L}_i}$ which are not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$. This shows that $j_0 d/n$ must be less than $d - (d/n) = (n - 1)d/n$, i.e., $j_0 < n - 1$. In this case we let $k = j_0 + 1 < n$ and let $\mathbf{L}_{i_k} = \overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}}$. Then conditions 1 and 3 are satisfied. Further, in addition to the at least $j_0 d/n$ coefficient vectors in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}$, we have more than d/n additional coefficient vectors $\overline{\mathbf{L}_i}$ in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{j_0}}, \mathbf{L}_{i_k}$. This shows that condition 2 holds as well.

LEMMA 11. Suppose $a(F)$ is either undefined or at least d/n . Let k and $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_k}$ be as in Lemma 10. Then there are linearly independent $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which share the same span as $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_k}$.

Proof. Suppose $0 \leq l < k$ and $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l \in \mathbb{R}^n$ have been chosen so that their span is equal to the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_l}$.

If $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}}$ is in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}$, then it is in the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l, \mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}$. In this case write

$$\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}} = (a + ib)\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}} + \mathbf{z},$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is in the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l$. Note that both the real and imaginary parts of $\mathbf{z}$ are in the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l$ since the $\mathbf{K}_i$ s are real. A short computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Re(\mathbf{z}) + (a - 1)\Re(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}) &= b\Im(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}) \\ \Im(\mathbf{z}) + b\Re(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}) &= -(a + 1)\Im(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}).\end{aligned}$$

If both $b = 0$ and $a = -1$, then we let $\mathbf{K}_{l+1} = \Im(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}})$. Otherwise we let $\mathbf{K}_{l+1} = \Re(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}})$. In either case the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l, \mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}$ is equal to the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_l, \mathbf{K}_{l+1}$.

If $\overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}}$ is not in the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}$, then $\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+2}} = \overline{\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}}}$. We let $\mathbf{K}_{l+1} = \Re(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}})$ and $\mathbf{K}_{l+2} = \Im(\mathbf{L}_{i_{l+1}})$ in this case. Then the span of $\mathbf{L}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_{l+2}}$ is equal to the span of $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{l+2}$.

Proceeding in this fashion until $l = k$ yields the lemma.

LEMMA 12. Suppose $a(F)$ is either undefined or at least d/n . Let k be as in Lemma 10. Then there is an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{K}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}'_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < a \leq b$ satisfying

$$|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq a \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

and

$$|K'_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq b \quad i = k + 1, \dots, n,$$

we have

$$|F(\mathbf{x})|^{n/d} \leq n^n \mathcal{H}(F)^{n/d} a^k b^{n-k}.$$

Further, $V(F)$ is infinite and $N_F(m)$ is infinite for all m sufficiently large.

Proof. Get $\mathbf{K}_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}_k$ as in Lemma 11. Let $\mathbf{K}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}'_k$ be an orthonormal basis for their span, and enlarge this collection to an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{K}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}'_n$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathbf{x}$, a and b be as in the statement of the lemma. Now at least kd/n of the coefficient vectors $\mathbf{L}_i$ are in the span of $\mathbf{K}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{K}'_k$, and the corresponding factors of $F(\mathbf{X})$ satisfy

$$|L_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq n\|\mathbf{L}_i\| \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|K'_j(\mathbf{x})|\} = n\|\mathbf{L}_i\|a.$$

There are no more than $d - kd/n = (n - k)d/n$ factors $L_i(\mathbf{X})$ which remain, and they satisfy

$$|L_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq n\|\mathbf{L}_i\| \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \{|K'_j(\mathbf{x})|\} = n\|\mathbf{L}_i\|b.$$

Thus,

$$|F(\mathbf{x})| = \prod_{i=1}^d |L_i(\mathbf{x})| \leq n^d \mathcal{H}(F) a^{kd/n} b^{(n-k)d/n},$$

and the first part of the lemma is proven.

For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ write $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{K}'_i$. For any $a \leq 1$, the set of $\mathbf{x}$ satisfying

$$|x_i| \leq \begin{cases} a^{-k/(n-k)} & \text{if } i > k, \\ a & \text{if } i \leq k \end{cases}$$

is contained in the set of $\mathbf{x}$ satisfying $|F(\mathbf{x})| \leq n^d \mathcal{H}(F)$ by the first part of the lemma. Letting $\mathfrak{m}$ denote $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{|x_i|\}$ in what follows, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x_i| \leq 1} \cdots \int \left[\int_{|x_j| \leq \mathfrak{m}^{-k/(n-k)}} \cdots \int \prod_{j=k+1}^n dx_j \right] \prod_{i=1}^k dx_i \\ = 2^{n-k} \int_{|x_i| \leq 1} \cdots \int \mathfrak{m}^{-k} \prod_{i=1}^k dx_i \\ \geq \int_{\|(x_1, \dots, x_k)\| \leq 1} \cdots \int \|(x_1, \dots, x_k)\|^{-k} \prod_{i=1}^k dx_i \\ = kV(k) \int_0^1 r^{-1} dr \\ = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $V(k)$ denotes the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^k$. Thus the volume of the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|F(\mathbf{x})| \leq n^d \mathcal{H}(F)$ is infinite. By homogeneity, this shows that $V(F)$ is infinite.

Finally, let $0 < a \leq b$ satisfy $a^k b^{n-k} = 1$. Then the parallelepiped defined by $|K'_j(\mathbf{x})| \leq a$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ and $|K'_j(\mathbf{x})| \leq b$ for $j > k$ has volume 2^n . By Minkowski's theorem there is a nontrivial integral point in such a parallelepiped. Letting $a \rightarrow 0$, we get infinitely many nonzero integral points contained in such parallelepipeds. Thus, there are infinitely many integral $\mathbf{x}$ with $|F(\mathbf{x})| \leq n^d \mathcal{H}(F)$.

6. Small solutions

Let $B_0 \geq 1$. Any solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to (1) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq B_0$ will be called a *small solution*. We will use $B_0 = m^{1/(d-a(F))}$ in our proofs of the theorems, but since most of our estimates up until that point will not require “small” to be dependent on m , we will leave B_0 variable when possible. In this section we will bound both the volume of all small real solutions to (1) and the number of small integral solutions, and we will also compare the volume of all small solutions with the number of small integral solutions. As a notational convenience, let S_0 denote the cardinality of the set of small integral solutions and let V_0 denote the volume of all small solutions.

LEMMA 13. *Suppose $I(F)$ is not empty, $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is minimal among forms equivalent to F , $\mathcal{H}(F) > 1$ and F has no nontrivial integral zeros. Then*

$$V_0 \ll m^{n/d} \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1}$$

and

$$S_0 \ll m^{n/d} \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1} + B_0^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 6, for any solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to (1) there is an n -tuple in $I'(F)$ with

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{|L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \ll \frac{m^{n/d}}{\mathcal{H}(F)^{1/d}}.$$

Set $A = m^{n/d}/\mathcal{H}(F)^{1/d}$, $C = B_0$ and $D = \mathcal{H}(F)^{1/nd}$ in Lemma 7'. We see that the solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to the above inequality with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C$ lie in

$$\ll 1 + (\log_D C)^{n-1} \ll \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1}$$

convex sets of the form (15) with

$$\prod_{j=1}^n a_i \ll D^n A = m^{n/d}.$$

By Lemma 9, such a convex set has volume $\ll m^{n/d}$. There are no more than $\binom{d}{n}$ n -tuples to consider here by (2), so we get our bound for V_0 .

As for S_0 , we estimate exactly as above. The difference is that our convex sets may not contain n linearly independent integral points; they may lie in

a proper rational subspace. So it remains to estimate the number of integral points in these proper subspaces. By (2) again, there are

$$\ll \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)}\right)^{n-1}$$

such subspaces to deal with. We claim that for any proper rational subspace of $\mathbb{Q}^n$ of dimension n' , the number of integral points in the subspace with length at most B_0 is $\ll B_0^{n'}$. Our proof will be complete once we show this claim.

We prove our claim by induction on n' . If $n' = 1$ the result is obvious. Now suppose W is a proper rational subspace of dimension $n' > 1$. Let Λ be the lattice of integral points in W . If Λ doesn't contain n' linearly independent points of length no more than B_0 , then we apply the induction hypothesis to the proper subspace of W these small lattice points span (and use $B_0 \geq 1$) to show that Λ contains $\ll B_0^{n'}$ lattice points of length at most B_0 .

Suppose Λ contains n' linearly independent lattice points of length at most B_0 . Let $T \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be an orthonormal transformation taking W to the span of the first n' canonical basis vectors of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n'}$ be the set of points of length at most B_0 . Since $T(\Lambda)$ is a lattice containing n' linearly independent lattice points in $\mathcal{C}$ and T is orthonormal, Lemma 8 gives

$$|\mathcal{C} \cap T(\Lambda)| \ll \frac{B_0^{n'}}{\det(T(\Lambda))} = \frac{B_0^{n'}}{\det(\Lambda)}.$$

It is well known that $\det(\Lambda) \geq 1$, so we see that the number of integral points in W with length at most B_0 is $\ll B_0^{n'}$. Our claim follows by induction, whence our proof of Lemma 13 is complete.

For the purposes of Theorem 3, we need to compare the number of integral small solutions with the total volume of all small solutions. It proves convenient here to use the sup norm rather than the Euclidean norm. So let V'_0 denote the volume of all solutions to (1) with sup norm at most B_0 , and similarly for S'_0 .

LEMMA 14. *With the notation above, we have*

$$|S'_0 - V'_0| \leq dn(2B_0 + 1)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. Let μ denote the usual Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and let ν denote the σ -finite measure gotten from the characteristic function of $\mathbb{Z}$, that is, $\nu(E)$ is the number of integer points in the set E for any Borel set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Let χ be the characteristic function of the set

$$\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |F(\mathbf{y})| \leq m \text{ and } |y_i| \leq B_0 \text{ for all } i\}.$$

What we want to do here is estimate the difference between the integrals of χ with respect to the product measures μ^n and ν^n . The lemma follows from the case $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ of the following claim:

For any nonempty subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and fixed values $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \notin I$, we have

$$\left| \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I} d\mu(y_i) - \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I} d\nu(y_i) \right| \leq d|I|(2B_0 + 1)^{|I|-1},$$

where $|I|$ denotes the cardinality of I . The major point of this estimate is that it is independent of the particular choices of $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i \notin I$. We prove this claim (and whence Lemma 14) by induction on the cardinality of I .

Suppose that $I = \{i_0\}$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are fixed for $i \neq i_0$. Then

$$F(y_1, \dots, y_{i_0}, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}[Y_{i_0}]$$

is a polynomial in one variable of degree no greater than d . This implies that the set

$$E = \{y_{i_0} \in \mathbb{R} : |F(y_1, \dots, y_n)| \leq m \text{ and } |y_i| \leq B_0 \text{ for all } i\}$$

is a (possibly empty) union of no more than d nonintersecting closed intervals. Now

$$\int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\mu(y_{i_0}) = \int_E d\mu(y_{i_0})$$

and similarly for the ν measure. Further, the difference between the length of a closed interval and the number of integer values therein is between -1 and 1 . This shows the case $|I| = 1$ of the claim.

Now suppose $|I| > 1$. We will use the induction hypothesis twice and the Fubini-Tonelli theorem to show the claim holds for I . Choose $i_0 \in I$. Then by the Fubini-Tonelli theorem and the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I} d\mu(y_i) - \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I} d\nu(y_i) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int \left[\int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\mu(y_i) - \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \right] d\mu(y_{i_0}) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int \cdots \int \left[\int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\mu(y_{i_0}) - \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\nu(y_{i_0}) \right] \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the induction hypothesis on $I \setminus \{i_0\}$ and the fact that χ is the characteristic function of a set contained in the cube $\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y_i| \leq B_0\}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \left[\int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\mu(y_i) - \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \right] d\mu(y_{i_0}) \right| \\ & \leq \int \left| \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\mu(y_i) - \int \cdots \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \right| d\mu(y_{i_0}) \\ & \leq \int_{[-B_0, B_0]} d(|I| - 1)(2B_0 + 1)^{|I|-2} d\mu(y_{i_0}) \\ & = 2B_0 d(|I| - 1)(2B_0 + 1)^{|I|-2} < d(|I| - 1)(2B_0 + 1)^{|I|-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \cdots \int \left[\int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\mu(y_{i_0}) - \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\nu(y_{i_0}) \right] \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \right| \\ & \leq \int \cdots \int \left| \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\mu(y_{i_0}) - \int \chi(y_1, \dots, y_n) d\nu(y_{i_0}) \right| \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \\ & \leq \int_{[-B_0, B_0]} \cdots \int_{[-B_0, B_0]} d \prod_{i \in I, i \neq i_0} d\nu(y_i) \\ & = d(2[B_0] + 1)^{|I|-1} \leq d(2B_0 + 1)^{|I|-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding these two estimates together finishes our proof of the claim.

7. Estimating large solutions

Throughout this section we will assume that $a(F)$ is defined and less than d/n (this forces $d > n$). It is appropriate at this time to note some inequalities involving $a(F)$ and $c(F)$ under this assumption. By definition, $ka(F) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for some $k < n$, so that $kna(F) \leq kd - 1$ and

$$(16) \quad 1 \leq a(F) \leq \frac{d}{n} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)}.$$

Using this, we get

$$(17) \quad n - d \leq \frac{na(F) - d}{a(F)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - n}.$$

If the discriminant of F is not zero, then

$$1 \leq \binom{d-1}{n-1} - 1 = c(F).$$

If the discriminant of F is zero, then by (2), (16) and (17)

$$\begin{aligned} c(F) &= \frac{b(F)}{n!} \times \frac{d - (n-1)a(F)}{a(F)} - \frac{1}{a(F)} \\ &< |I'(F)|(d-n+1) \\ &\leq \binom{d}{n}(d-n+1). \end{aligned}$$

Here we also used $b(F)/n! \leq |I'(F)|$, which is clear from the definitions. Using $b(F)/n! \geq 1$ (which is also clear from the definitions), and $a(F) < d/n$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} c(F) &= \frac{b(F)}{n!} \times \frac{d - (n-1)a(F)}{a(F)} - \frac{1}{a(F)} \\ &\geq \frac{d - na(F)}{a(F)} + \frac{a(F) - 1}{a(F)} \\ &> \frac{(d-n)}{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(18) \quad \frac{(d-n)}{d} \leq c(F) \leq \binom{d}{n}(d-n+1).$$

For indices $l \geq 0$ let $B_l = e^l B_0$ and $C_l = e^{l+1} B_0$. Let

$$A_0 = m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}$$

and for $l \geq 0$ let $A_l = e^{(na(F)-d)l/a(F)} A_0$. Recall that $m, B_0 \geq 1$ by hypothesis and $\mathcal{H}(F) \geq 1$ by Lemma 3. By (16), (17), and (18)

$$(19) \quad A_l = e^{(na(F)-d)l/a(F)} A_0 \geq B_0^{n-d} e^{l(n-d)}.$$

Let V_{l+1} denote the total volume of the set of solutions $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to (1) with $B_l \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_l$.

LEMMA 15. *If $I(F)$ is not empty and $a(F) < d/n$, then*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} V_l \ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} (1 + \log B_0)^{n-2}.$$

Proof of the proposition. Set $m = B_0 = 1$. Clearly $V_0 \ll 1$. By Lemma 15 $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} V_l < \infty$ whenever $a(F)$ is defined and less than d/n . This together with Lemma 12 proves the proposition.

Proof of Lemma 15. By Lemma 5, for any solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to (1) with $B_l \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|$ there is an n -tuple in $I'(F)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
 (20) \quad \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} &\ll \left(\frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} \\
 &\leq \left(\frac{m}{B_l^{d-na(F)}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} \\
 &= m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} e^{(na(F)-d)l/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} \\
 &= A_l.
 \end{aligned}$$

We will estimate using Lemma 7. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (21) \quad \max \left\{ n!, n^3 \left(\log(B_l C_l^{n-1} / n! n^{n/2} A_l) \right)^{n-2} \right\} \\
 \leq \max \left\{ n!, n^3 \left(\log(B_0^d e^{n(l+1)} / e^{l(n-d)}) \right)^{n-2} \right\} \\
 \ll (1 + l + \log B_0)^{n-2}
 \end{aligned}$$

by (19). Setting $A = A_l$, $B = B_l$, $C = C_l$ and $D = e$ in Lemma 7, we see by (21) that the solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (20) with $B_l \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_l$ are contained in $\ll (1 + l + \log B_0)^{n-2}$ convex sets of the form (15) with

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \ll \frac{C_l A_l}{B_l} \ll A_l \leq e^{l/(1-n)} A_0$$

by (17). According to Lemma 9, the volume of such a convex set is $\ll e^{l/(1-n)} A_0$. Taking into account the total number of possible n -tuples in $I'(F)$ using (2), we find that

$$V_{l+1} \ll e^{l/(1-n)} A_0 (1 + l + \log B_0)^{n-2} \leq \frac{(1 + l)^{n-2}}{(e^{1/(n-1)})^l} A_0 (1 + \log B_0)^{n-2}.$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} V_{l+1} &\ll A_0 (1 + \log B_0)^{n-2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{(l + 1)^{n-2}}{(e^{1/(n-1)})^l} \\
 &\ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} (1 + \log B_0)^{n-2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

When estimating the number of integer solutions to (1) of length greater than B_0 , we proceed very much as in the proof of Lemma 15. However, since we are counting integer solutions as opposed to estimating volumes, we must also account for the possibility that all solutions in a given convex set of the

form (15) lie in a proper subspace, so that Lemma 9 cannot be used in a manner similar to our use of it in the proof above. Our goal is to reach the point where we may estimate the remaining (extremely large) integer solutions using a quantitative version of the subspace theorem.

LEMMA 16. *Suppose $I(F)$ is not empty and $a(F) < d/n$. Then the integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $B_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|$ lie in the union of a set of cardinality S satisfying*

$$S \ll m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} (1 + \log B_0)^{n-2} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}$$

and

$$\ll (1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F)) (1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F) + \log B_0)^{n-2}$$

proper rational subspaces.

Proof. Exactly as in the proof of Lemma 15, any integral solution $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $B_l \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_l$ satisfies (20) for some n -tuple in $I'(F)$. We apply Lemma 7 again, getting the same convex sets of the form (15) as in the proof of Lemma 15. When those sets contain n linearly independent lattice points, we estimate the number of such points using Lemma 9 exactly as we estimated the V_{l+1} above. These points make up the set of cardinality S .

By (21), our solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (20) with $B_l \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_l$ lie in the union of $\ll (l+1 + \log B_0)^{n-2}$ convex sets of the form (15). Taking into account the different possible n -tuples, we see that those solutions $\mathbf{x}$ with $B_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_l$ not already accounted for in S lie in the union of $\ll (l+1)(l+1 + \log B_0)^{n-2}$ proper rational subspaces. We need to determine how large l should be so that solutions of length at least C_l can be dealt with using the subspace theorem.

If

$$\frac{l+1}{2(n-1)} \geq \log m + \binom{d}{n} (d-n+1) \log(\mathcal{H}(F)),$$

then by Lemma 2, (16), (17) and (18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_l^{(d-na(F))/2a(F)} &\geq C_l^{1/2(n-1)} \geq e^{(l+1)/2(n-1)} \\ &\geq m \mathcal{H}(F)^{\binom{d}{n}(d-n+1)} \\ &\geq m^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5 and (17), for any solution $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq C_l$ there is an n -tuple in $I'(F)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} &\ll \left(\frac{|F(\mathbf{x})|}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^{d-na(F)}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^{(d-na(F))/2a(F)}} \left(\frac{m}{C_l^{(d-na(F))/2}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1/2(n-1)} \left(\frac{m}{C_l^{(d-na(F))/2}} \right)^{1/a(F)} \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let l_0 be least such that $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq C_{l_0}$ implies that

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} < \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1/2(n-1)}.$$

By what we showed above, $l_0 \ll 1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F)$. Let l_1 be the least such that $C_{l_1} \geq m^{1/d} C_{l_0}$ and $C_{l_1} \geq m^{1/d} \mathcal{H}(F)$. Then $l_1 \ll 1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F)$, too.

The integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $B_0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_{l_1}$ either lie in our set of cardinality S or

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll l_1(l_1 + 1 + \log B_0)^{n-2} \\ &\ll (1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F))(1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F) + \log B_0)^{n-2} \end{aligned}$$

proper rational subspaces. Since the solutions to $F(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ lie in no more than d proper subspaces, we restrict ourselves for what remains to integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $|F(\mathbf{x})| \geq 1$ and $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq C_{l_1}$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be such a solution and write $\mathbf{x} = g\mathbf{x}'$ for some primitive integer point $\mathbf{x}'$ and some integer $g \geq 1$. By the homogeneity of F ,

$$m \geq |F(\mathbf{x})| = |F(g\mathbf{x}')| = g^d |F(\mathbf{x}')| \geq g^d,$$

so that $g \leq m^{1/d}$. Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{x}'\| \geq m^{-1/d} \|\mathbf{x}\| \geq m^{-1/d} C_{l_1} \geq \max\{C_{l_0}, \mathcal{H}(F)\}$$

and $\mathbf{x}'$ is a primitive solution to (1).

By the definition of l_0 , we have

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x}')|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} < \|\mathbf{x}'\|^{-1/2(n-1)}$$

for some n -tuple in $I'(F)$. By Lemma 2 we may assume each $\mathbf{L}_{i_j}$ here is defined over a number field of degree at most d and has field height at most $\mathcal{H}(F) \leq \|\mathbf{x}'\|$. By a version of the quantitative subspace theorem due to Evertse

[E2, Corollary], the set of such primitive integral $\mathbf{x}'$ lies in the union of $\ll 1$ proper subspaces. Taking into account the number of possible n -tuples using (2), we see that the integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq C_{l_1}$ lie in $\ll 1$ proper rational subspaces. This completes the proof.

8. Proof of the theorems

As remarked above, to prove our theorems we set $B_0 = m^{1/(d-a(F))}$, giving

$$\begin{aligned}
 (22) \quad m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} &= m^{1/a(F)} m^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)(d-a(F))} \\
 &= m^{(d-a(F)+na(F)-d)/a(F)(d-a(F))} \\
 &= m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. By the proposition, it suffices to prove that $V(F) \ll 1$ when $I(F)$ is not empty and $a(F) < d/n$. Moreover, by homogeneity we need only show that $m^{n/d} V(F) \ll m^{n/d}$ for some positive m . We may assume $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is minimal among forms equivalent to F since $V(F)$ is invariant under equivalence.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{H}(F) = 1$. In this case we set $m = 1$, too. Clearly V_0 is no larger than the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By (22) and Lemma 15 we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} V_l \ll 1;$$

thus,

$$V(F) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} V_l \ll 1.$$

Now suppose $\mathcal{H}(F) > 1$. By (16) we have

$$(23) \quad \frac{n-1}{d-a(F)} \leq \frac{n-1}{d - \frac{d}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n-1)}} = \frac{n}{d + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2}}.$$

Choose m so that

$$\mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} = m^{\frac{n}{d+1/2(n-1)^2}}.$$

Then $\log m \gg \log \mathcal{H}(F)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2} \ll m^{n/d}$$

by (18) and (23). By Lemma 13,

$$\begin{aligned} V_0 &\ll m^{n/d} \left(1 + \frac{\log B_0}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1} \\ &\ll m^{n/d} \left(1 + \frac{\log m}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \right)^{n-1} \\ &\ll m^{n/d}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 15 and (22),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} V_l &\ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{1/a(F)} B_0^{(na(F)-d)/a(F)} \\ &= \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2} \ll m^{n/d}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$m^{n/d} V(F) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} V_l \ll m^{n/d}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose W is a proper rational subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ of dimension n' . Then there is a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with

$$T : W \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : z_i = 0 \text{ for } i > n'\}.$$

Then $G := F \circ T^{-1}$ is an equivalent form, and F restricted to W is equivalent to G restricted to $\mathbb{R}^{n'}$. In this manner, we see that considering integral solutions to (1) for F restricted to a proper rational subspace is equivalent to considering integral solutions to (1) for a form in fewer variables. With this in mind, we will prove that $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$ when F is of finite type by induction on n . But we first deal with the simpler case when F is not of finite type.

Suppose that F is not of finite type. Then there is some nontrivial subspace W defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ where the volume of solutions to (1) in W is infinite. Let $n' \geq 1$ be the dimension of W . If $n' = 1$, then F vanishes on W . Trivially $N_F(m)$ is infinite for all m in this case. Suppose $n' > 1$ and get a form $F'(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{X}]$ in n' variables where the $\mathbf{x}$ in W are in one-to-one correspondence with $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n'}$ via a $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with $F(\mathbf{x}) = F'(\mathbf{x}')$ as above. Since $V(F')$ is infinite by hypothesis, the proposition shows that $a(F')$ is either undefined or at least d/n' . Lemma 12 shows that $N_{F'}(m)$ is infinite for all sufficiently large m . Thus, there are infinitely many solutions $\mathbf{x} \in W \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ to (1) for all sufficiently large m . This shows that $N_F(m)$ is infinite for all sufficiently large m when F is not of finite type.

Now suppose F is of finite type. Interestingly, our argument for the first step in the induction where $n = 2$ is the same as our argument for $n > 2$ using the induction hypothesis. Rather than present the same argument twice,

then, we will simply assume that $n \geq 2$ and that the number of integral solutions to (1) restricted to a proper subspace of dimension $n' < n$ is $\ll m^{n'/d}$. The number of solutions to (1) restricted to any proper 1-dimensional rational subspace is $\ll m^{1/d}$, since F is not identically 0 on such a subspace, so our assumption in the case $n = 2$ is correct. Finally, without loss of generality we may assume $\mathcal{H}(F)$ is minimal among forms equivalent to F .

By the proposition, $I(F)$ is not empty and $a(F) < d/n$. Suppose first that

$$\mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} \leq m^{\frac{n}{d+1/2(n-1)^2}}.$$

Then (18) and (23) show that $\log \mathcal{H}(F) \ll \log m$, and we also have

$$\mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2} \ll m^{n/d}.$$

By Theorem 1, $V'_0 \leq m^{n/d} V(F) \ll m^{n/d}$, so (22), (23) and Lemma 14 give $S'_0 \ll m^{n/d}$. Further, (22), (23), and Lemma 16 show that the integral solutions of length at least B_0 lie in the union of a set of cardinality $\ll m^{n/d}$ and $\ll (1 + \log m)^{n-1}$ proper subspaces. By the induction hypothesis (or the trivial 1-dimensional case when $n = 2$), these proper subspaces contribute

$$\ll m^{(n-1)/d} (1 + \log m)^{n-1} \ll m^{n/d}$$

integral solutions. So $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$.

Now suppose

$$\mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} \geq m^{\frac{n}{d+1/2(n-1)^2}},$$

so that $\log \mathcal{H}(F) \gg 1 + \log m$ by (18) and (23). Let C_{l_1} be as in the proof of Lemma 16. As shown in the proof of Lemma 16, $l_1 \ll (1 + \log m + \log \mathcal{H}(F))$.

By Lemma 6, if $\mathbf{x}$ is a solution to (1), then there is a n -tuple in $I'(F)$ such that

$$\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n |L_{i_j}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\det(\mathbf{L}_{i_1}^{tr}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{i_n}^{tr})|} \ll m^{n/d} \mathcal{H}(F)^{-1/d}.$$

We use Lemma 7' with $A = m^{n/d} \mathcal{H}(F)^{-1/d}$, $C = C_{l_1}$ and $D = \mathcal{H}(F)^{1/nd}$. We have

$$\log_D \left(\frac{C^n}{n!A} \right) \ll \frac{\log C_{l_1}}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \ll \frac{\log m + l_1}{\log \mathcal{H}(F)} \ll 1,$$

so the set of all such $\mathbf{x}$ with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_{l_1}$ lie in $\ll 1$ convex sets of the form (15) with

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \ll D^n A = m^{n/d}.$$

By Lemma 9, if such a set contains n linearly independent integral points, it contains $\ll m^{n/d}$ of them. Taking into account the number of possible n -tuples via (2), we see that the integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq C_{l_1}$ lie in the union

of $\ll 1$ proper rational subspaces and a set of cardinality $\ll m^{n/d}$. As shown in the proof of Lemma 16, all integral solutions $\mathbf{x}$ to (1) with $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq C_{l_1}$ lie in $\ll 1$ proper subspaces. By the induction hypothesis (or the trivial 1-dimensional case if $n = 2$), all our proper subspaces contain $\ll m^{(n-1)/d}$ integral solutions total. So $N_F(m) \ll m^{n/d}$.

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 15 and (21) we have

$$m^{n/d}V(F) - V'_0 \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} V_l \ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2}.$$

By Lemma 14, we get

$$|S'_0 - m^{n/d}V(F)| \ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2}.$$

As we saw in the proof of Theorem 2, the number of integral solutions to (1) restricted to any proper subspace is $\ll m^{(n-1)/d}$. By Lemma 16 and (21) then, the number of integral solutions to (1) with length at least B_0 is

$$\ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2}.$$

From this, we get

$$N_F(m) - S'_0 \ll \mathcal{H}(F)^{c(F)} m^{(n-1)/(d-a(F))} (1 + \log m)^{n-2}.$$

Theorem 3 follows.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, DEKALB, IL
 E-mail address: jthunder@math.niu.edu

REFERENCES

- [B] M. BEAN, An isoperimetric inequality for the area of plane regions defined by binary forms, *Compositio Math.* **92** (1994), 115–131.
- [BT] M. BEAN and J. L. THUNDER, Isoperimetric inequalities for volumes associated with decomposable forms, *J. London Math. Soc.* **54** (1996), 39–49.
- [E1] J.-H. EVERTSE, On equations in S-units and the Thue-Mahler equation, *Invent. Math.* **75** (1984), 561–584.
- [E2] ———, An improvement of the quantitative subspace theorem, *Compositio Math.* **101** (1996), 225–311.
- [E3] ———, On the norm form inequality $|F(\mathbf{x})| \leq h$, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **56** (2000), 337–374.
- [M] K. MAHLER, Zur Approximation algebraischer Zahlen III, *Acta Math.* **62** (1934), 91–166.
- [R] K. RAMACHANDRA, A lattice-point problem for norm forms in several variables, *J. Number Theory* **1** (1969), 534–555.
- [S1] W. M. SCHMIDT, Norm form equations, *Ann. of Math.* **96** (1972), 526–551.
- [S2] ———, The number of solutions of norm form equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **317** (1989), 197–227.

- [S3] W. M. SCHMIDT, *Diophantine Approximations and Diophantine Equations, Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1467**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [T] A. THUE, Über Annäherungswerte algebraischer Zahlen, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **135** (1909), 284–305.

(Received January 24, 2000)